This matter comes before the Court on plaintiff's *pro se* motion for "Change of Venue; Hold for Perkalation [sic]." Dkt. #65. On July 31, 2006, the above-captioned matter was dismissed with prejudice. See Dkt. #59 (Order granting defendant's motion for summary judgment); Dkt. #60 (Judgment). Plaintiff's motion for "Change of Venue; Hold for Perkalation [sic]" is therefore stricken as moot. After entry of judgment, the Court considers only appropriate post-judgment motions and notices of appeal.

Additionally, the motion was not noted for consideration on the Court's calendar as required by LR 7(b). Plaintiff has been directed three times to review the Court's local civil rules to ensure compliance with the requirements of LR 7. See Orders at Dkt. #25, #55, and #64. Plaintiff was warned in July 2006 and August 2006 that future motions filed without a note date will be stricken and not considered by the Court. Dkt. #55 and #64. Plaintiff's latest motion fails to comply with the local rules.

ORDER STRIKING MOTION

For all of the foregoing reasons, plaintiff's motion for "Change of Venue; Hold for Perkalation [sic]" is hereby STRICKEN. The Court will not take any further action with respect to Dkt. #65.

DATED this 31st day of October, 2006.

MMS (asmik Robert S. Lasnik

United States District Judge